

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and are not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. **If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues, or believes that some or all of the claims are not in condition for allowance, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to schedule a telephone Examiner Interview before any further actions on the merits.**

The applicants will now address each of the issues raised in the outstanding Office Action.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 6, 10-13, 16 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,652,930 ("the Teremy patent"). The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

At least some of the patentable features of these claims are addressed below. First, however, the Teremy patent is introduced.

The Teremy patent concerns a camera provided with a display including an organic electroluminescent material (OLED), in which the OLED is set to emit light of

different colors according to the camera conditions. That is, different colors are used to convey different camera conditions. (See, e.g., the Abstract.) More specifically, the colors of individual elements convey meaning. (See, e.g., column 6, lines 7-10.) Each icon of a display 40 is defined by one illumination element.

(See, e.g., column 5, lines 14 and 15.) As can be appreciated from the foregoing, the colors of the display section of the Teremy patent are predetermined in association with the camera conditions, and are not settable or changeable by an operator.

Even though the display 40 is internal to the camera (See, e.g., Figure 2 and column 4, lines 33-35.), the brightness of the display is controlled on the basis of the intensity of the ambient light as sensed by a photocell. (See, e.g., column 6, lines 43-46, and column 7, lines 31-40.) As can be appreciated from the foregoing, the brightness of the display section of the Teremy patent is automatically adjusted based on detected ambient light conditions -- the operator cannot manually change the brightness of the display.

The present invention has a structure which permits the operator to manually change the driving conditions of the organic EL element, to provide a display device for a camera. This is advantageous in that it enables a clear and simple display; one that is comfortable for the operator. More specifically, independent claims 1, 6, and 10 recite that the driving conditions for driving a display are manually changeable by an operator. Similarly, independent claims 11, 16 and 20 recite that data corresponding to the driving conditions is manually settable by an operator. Finally, independent claim 21

recites setting luminous brightness and luminous color for a laminated EL element. Since these features are not taught by the Teremy patent, these claims are not anticipated by the Teremy patent for at least this reason. Since claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, since claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 11, and since claim 22 depends from claim 21, these claims are similarly not anticipated by the Teremy patent.

Claims 6, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,021,280 ("the Osato patent"). The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

At least some of the patentable features of these claims are addressed below. First, however, the Osato patent is introduced.

The Osato patent concerns a display system for a camera for bringing error conditions to the attention of a user. In a first embodiment, the display flickers to bring the error condition to the user's attention. (See, e.g., column 3, line 56 through column 4, line 41.) In a second embodiment, when an error occurs, the display is turned OFF until a user presses a power switch (or some other switch). (See, e.g., column 4, lines 42-57 and column 5, lines 8-13.) In a third embodiment, after an error is displayed, a user can suspend such display by pressing a power switch (or some other switch). (See, e.g., column 4, line 58, through column 5, line 13.) Although the Osato patent discloses than an LED display may be used as a liquid crystal panel, it does not

describe that the operator can set the luminous color, luminous brightness, etc. of the display. In the system of the Osato patent, the operator cannot manually change the luminous color, nor can the operator change the brightness. Note that the manipulation of the power switch in the second and third embodiments turns on the display error or turns off the display error. This is not the same as manually changeable driving conditions for driving an organic electroluminescent element.

Independent claim 6 recites that driving conditions, which are used for driving an organic electroluminescent element, are manually changeable. Accordingly, claim 6 is not anticipated by the Osato patent for at least this reason. Since claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 6, these claims are similarly not anticipated by the Osato patent.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 5, 7-9, 14, 15 and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Teremy patent in view of the Osato patent. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

These claims are not rendered unpatentable by the Teremy and Osato patents for the reasons stated above. Furthermore, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine these references as proposed by the Examiner. The Osato patent merely teaches a power switch and a mode switch, both of which are extremely common in all types of camera. Although the Osato patent discusses that other switches can be used in the second and third

embodiments to turn on the display error or turn off the display error, this is not the same as manually changeable driving conditions for driving an organic electroluminescent element. Moreover, this has nothing whatsoever to do with the auto-brightness control of the Teremy patent, nor does it have anything to do with using colors to convey various camera conditions. Indeed, the automated aspects of the Teremy patent would, if anything, suggest automated control of brightness and color, and would therefore lead one skilled in the art away from manual adjustment.

Furthermore, neither of the above references discloses the structure of the EL element. Even if Teremy and Osato are combined, it is not obvious to use an organic EL element having a laminated structure in a display section of a camera as the display device of the camera.

#### New claims

New claims 23-37 serve to further distinguish the present invention over the cited art.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the applicants request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.



Respectfully submitted,

February 20, 2004

John C. Pokotylo  
John C. Pokotylo, Attorney  
Reg. No. 36,242  
Tel.: (732) 542-9070

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on **February 20, 2004** with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

John C. Pokotylo  
John C. Pokotylo

36,242  
Reg. No.

**RECEIVED**

FEB 27 2004

Technology Center 2600